



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	. 1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/619,412		07/16/2003	Merrill-Lee Peterson	2280-001	7369	
27522	7590	05/11/2005	EXAMINER			
SEAN W.		 ·	BROWN,	BROWN, PETER R		
THE BURN		, SUITE 360 PING	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
CALGARY	, AB T2	2G 5C3	3636	3636		
CANADA	٠			DATE MAILED: 05/11/2009	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applica	ition No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)			
		10/619	,412	PETERSON, MERRILL-LEE				
	Office Action Summary	Examin	ier	Art Unit				
		Peter R		3636				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic or Reply	ation appears on t	the cover sheet with (the correspondence ac	idress			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC nsions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the reply specified above is less than thirty (30) period for reply is specified above, the maximum stating to reply within the set or extended period for reply wreply received by the Office later than three months afted patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. f 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no nication. days, a reply within the sutory period will apply and ill, by statute, cause the a	event, however, may a reply statutory minimum of thirty (30 d will expire SIX (6) MONTHS application to become ABANI	be timely filed O) days will be considered timel from the mailing date of this coonsidered timel				
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on						
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 28	o)⊠ This action is	non-final.					
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	ion of Claims							
5) <u></u> 6)⊠	 ✓ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. ✓ Claim(s) 1,9 and 17 is/are rejected. ✓ Claim(s) 2-8 and 10-16 is/are objected to. ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 							
Applicati	on Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any object	ion to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including t The oath or declaration is objected to	•		•				
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)(Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority d 2. Certified copies of the priority d 3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internation See the attached detailed Office action	ocuments have be ocuments have be f the priority docur al Bureau (PCT R	een received. een received in Appl ments have been rec tule 17.2(a)).	ication No ceived in this National	Stage			
Attachmen	, ,							
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Infon	e of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or P r No(s)/Mail Date			mary (PTO-413) ail Date mal Patent Application (PT0	O-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/619,412

Art Unit: 3636

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claim is improper in that it appears to be relying on the user for definition. The phrases "straddling the user", "sandwich the user", and "the weight of the user is supported", are deemed questionable in this regard.

The phrase "mating with the seat member with the straddle edges" is confusing and unclear, and it is not seen how the user is "sandwiched" between the panels and the seat member.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Baker.

Figure 4 shows structure as claimed, including side panels 14 that are hinged at their edges to form a "straddle edge" with slots 38 formed therein. A "seat" member 32 includes seat stops 36 which engage the slots 38.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject

Application/Control Number: 10/619,412

Art Unit: 3636

matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9 and 17, so far as definite, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker.

To have utilized a conventional hinge mechanism to interconnected the side panels, for durability purposes, would have been an obvious modification to one with ordinary skill in the art.

The method of set up and assembly of the Baker device would have encompassed the corresponding method steps in claim 17.

Claims 2-8 and 10-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Steuer, Downing, Kyte, Milner, Jr, Calco, Swilley, Oyediran, Jones, and Cochran show various features of the invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter R. Brown whose telephone number is 571-272-6853. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Application/Control Number: 10/619,412

Art Unit: 3636

Page 4

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peter R. Brown Primary Examiner Art Unit 3636

prb